

Remarks

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 6 are currently amended. New claims 11-13 are added. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The non-final Office Action dated September 7, 2007 lists the following rejection: claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Martel *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,165).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 102(b) rejection of claims 1-10 because the cited portions of the Martel reference do not correspond to the claimed invention which includes, for example, aspects directed to storing at least one configuration parameter at a location within the subsystem in response to the activation signal. The Office Action asserts that Martel teaches (*i.e.*, Col. 2:52-53) storing a hardware configuration in a configuration memory in response to a configuration signal. However, the cited portions of the Martel reference teach that the hardware configuration is stored in a configuration memory 19 and that the gate array 13 is set according to the contents of the configuration memory in response to the configuration signal. *See, e.g.*, Figure 1 and Col. 5:4-7. The hardware configuration is already stored in the configuration memory and it is accessed in response to the configuration signal. Thus, the cited portions of Martel do not teach storing a hardware configuration in a configuration memory in response to a configuration signal as asserted by the Office Action. Accordingly, the Section 102(b) rejection of claims 1-10 is improper and Applicant request that it be withdrawn.

In an effort to facilitate prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 6 to more expressly recite that the at least one configuration parameter is one of the configuration parameters that is stored in the storage portion of the configuration/control unit. Applicant submits that the amendments do not alter the intended scope of the claims, and are not made in response to any rejection.

Applicant has added new claims 11-13 which are distinguishable from the Martel reference for at least the same reasons discussed above relating to the 102(b) rejection of claims 1-10. For example, claims 11-13 contain aspects directed to writing one or more of the plurality of configuration parameters from the configuration/control unit to one or


more of the plurality of registers responsive to a single configuration/control ID, which is not disclosed by the cited portions of the Martel reference.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Peter Zawilski, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063 (or the undersigned).

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 
Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
651-686-6633
(NXPS.353PA)